



Fr: Rene Ortiz 560 E. Cactus Wren Dr., Casa Grande, AZ 85122

To:

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

James R. Browning Courthouse

95 7th Street

San Francisco, CA 94103

CV-24-3302-PHX-DWL  
CV-24-3304-PHX-KML  
CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL  
CV-24-2417-PHX-JAT

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona

Sandra Day O'Connor United States Courthouse

401 W. Washington St., Suite 10

Phoenix, AZ 85003

Date: December 9th, 2024

Subject: **REQUEST FOR HEARING AND FORWARDING OF SUBMISSION**

Dear Clerk of the Courts, and Honorable Judges,

I am writing to formally request a hearing on my case(s) and appeal(s). I am available for a hearing on the following dates: December 18, 2024, December 23, 2024, December 30, 2024, or January 3, 2025. I kindly ask that the District Court of Arizona schedule this hearing before Judge Krissa M. Lanham.

Additionally, I request that the Chief Justice of the Ninth Circuit Court, Mary Murguia, hear my appeal, if she presides over appeals in Phoenix. If Chief Justice Murguia does not hear appeals in Phoenix, I respectfully ask to be informed of her location so that I may appear in her courtroom.

If no hearing is granted, I demand that my case(s) and appeals be referred to the next appellant court beyond the Ninth Circuit. Should a hearing be scheduled, I request that my spouse, who serves as my caretaker, be notified promptly of the date and time. I ask to be informed no later than December 18, 2024.

MARTA DEL SOCORRO ORTIZ  
(916) 607-5385

NO MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

I also instruct the District Court to forward a copy of my submission to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and to ensure proper filing of my request.

For over six years, I have been in litigation solely seeking to regain my employment as a Veterans Claims Examiner with the Department of Veterans Affairs. The prolonged nature of this process has deeply affected my family relationships and my mental well-being. This issue was made evident during discussions with Secret Service Agents Savanna and Brandon, as well as Deputy V. St. Louis of the U.S. Marshals Service, whom I believe serves in Judge Tuchi's courtroom.

It is deeply disheartening that I, as a pro se litigant, have been denied the opportunity to be heard in court. Such prolonged denial of access to justice constitutes obstruction of justice. I have exhausted all patience and now demand the right to be heard without further delay.

I kindly ask for a timely response to my request and for my submission to be forwarded as necessary.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Rene Ortiz

Rene-ortiz@live.com

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 Plaintiff(s), Candidate for the Oval Office  
2 RENE ORTIZ, PAG, U.S. Marine Combat Veteran Represented by  
3 Department of Veterans Affairs, (VA), Commandant of the Marine Corps,  
4 The American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE)  
5 Veterans of Foreign Wars, (VFW)  
6 The United States Attorneys General, Sacramento Office (USAG) an official  
7 The Law Offices of "Alpha Zulu" (*Undisclosed due to Confidentiality & Privacy*)

8 El Municipio de Sáric Sonora México,  
9 El Estado de Sonora, México,  
10 Estados Unidos Mexicanos:

11 Joseph R. Biden Jr., President of the United States  
12 Claudia Sheinbaum Pardo President of Mexico  
13 Kamala D. Harris, Vice President of the United States

14 Attorneys/representative(s) for Plaintiff(s)/and Representative(s):

15 U.S. Attorney General of the United States, Merrick B. Garland

16 Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP:

17 Attorneys- Stephen Heald Turner #89627 Email: [stephen.turner@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:stephen.turner@lewisbrisbois.com);

18 Larissa Guerrero Nefulda #201903, Email: [larissa.nefulda@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:larissa.nefulda@lewisbrisbois.com)

19 Attorneys, Tutelary, Caretaker for Plaintiff(s), Veteran, and/or Fiduciary

20 Maria Del Socorro Ortiz

21 Camille Stroughter  
22 Oakland VA Regional Office Counsel

23 PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
24 United States Attorney

25 W. DEAN CARTER  
26 Assistant United States Attorney  
27 E-mail: [dean.carter@usdoj.gov](mailto:dean.carter@usdoj.gov)  
28 Telephone: (916) 554-2781  
Facsimile: (916) 554-2900

JOSEPH B. FRUEH  
Assistant United States Attorney  
E-mail: [joseph.frueh@usdoj.gov](mailto:joseph.frueh@usdoj.gov)  
Telephone: (916) 554-2702  
501 I Street, Suite 10-100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT  
OF APPEALS;**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA,**

**IN THE UNITED STATES EASTERN  
DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA,  
SACRAMENTO, &**

**THE VETERANS COURT OF VETERANS'  
APPEAL FOR VETERANS' CLAIMS**

Ortiz et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

The United States of America et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-24-3302-PHX-DWL  
Case No. CV-24-3304-PHX-KML  
Case No. CV-24-2416-PHX-DWL  
Case No. CV-24-2417-PHX-JAT

Case No. 2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR (DC-CA)

2:19-CV-2089-TLN-DB (DC-CA)

2:19-CV-2090-TLN-DB (DC-CA)

2:19-CV-2094-TLN-DB (DC-CA)

2:19-CV-2098-TLN-DB (DC-CA)

2:21-CV-01221-KJM-CKD (DC-CA)

9<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT COURT DOCKET NO.  
24-4001/24-5645/24-1369 (SF)

CAVC DOCKET NO. 190815-24143

Case 24-4746 (VA CT)

VBA DOCKET NO. 240318-450321  
(VBA)

**\*\* REQUEST FOR HEARING BEFORE  
THE NINTH CIRCUIT, DISTRICT OF**



Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**ARIZONA, AND VETERANS COURT OF  
APPEALS\*\***

**\*\* NOTICE OF APPEAL OF THE  
COURT(S), AND THE CLERK OF THE  
CLERK(S) ILLEGAL AND ERRONEOUS  
PROCEDURALS PRACTICES OF THE  
COURT(S) LAW(S) & RULE(S); (1)  
PROCEDURAL ERROR(S) AND COURTS;  
(2) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE OF THE  
HEARING HELD ON OCT 22TH; (3) THE  
CLOSING OF BOTH CASES (24-4216 & 24-  
4217) BASED ON HEARSAY TESTIMONY,  
EVIDENCE & MISREPRESENTATION(S)  
MADE BY SECOND OR THIRD-PARTIES  
\*\***

**\*\*THIS PETITION (STEP ONE GRIEVANCE,  
REQUEST MAST, 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT  
OF PETITION) IS FILED IAW THE 1<sup>ST</sup>  
AMENDMENT, MASTER AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN VA & AFGE, 2023, THE UCMJ &  
RELEVANT CASE LAW(S). NO FILING FEE  
OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE  
IMPOSED ON THE PETITIONER(S), AS  
THEY ARE EXERCISING THEIR  
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE  
IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS\*\***

**BEFORE:**

**Judge:**

**Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia; & Molly C.  
Dwyer Clerk of the Court;**

**Chief Judge Jennifer J. Zipps, Judge Krissa  
M. Lanham, & Debra D. Lucas Clerk of the  
Court;**

**Chief Justices Michael P. Allen, Judge Joseph  
L. Toth, & Tiffany M. Wagner Clerk of the  
Court.**

**Date: TBD**

**Time: TBD**

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**Ctrtm.:** TBD, No. \_\_\_, Floor  
**Complaint(s) Filed:** September 13, 2024,  
July 21, 2023  
**Trial Date:** TBD- No Need For a Trial

**Date:** December 6, 2024

**To:**

**The Honorable Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia, Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court, of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals;**

**Chief Judge Jennifer J. Zipps, Judge Krissa M. Lanham, and Debra D. Lucas, Clerk of the Court, United States District Court for the District of Arizona (Tucson & Phoenix);**

**Chief Judge Troy L. Nunley and Keith Holland, Clerk of the Court, Eastern District of California (Sacramento);**

**Chief Justices Michael P. Allen, Judge Joseph L. Toth, and Tiffany M. Wagner, Clerk of the Court, U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims**

**Subject: Request for Hearing Before the Ninth Circuit, District of Arizona, and Veterans Court of Appeals**

**Honorable Judges and Clerks,**

I, the plaintiff/appellant, respectfully request to be heard before the following Courts and officials to address the misunderstandings surrounding the Courts' orders for payment of fees and the filing of briefs and whatnot:

1. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals: Chief Judge Mary H. Murguia & Clerk of the Court Molly C. Dwyer

2. United States District Court for the District of Arizona: Chief Judge Jennifer J. Zipps, Judge Krissa M. Lanham & Clerk of the Court Debra D. Lucas

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

3. U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims: Chief Justice Michael P. Allen, Judge  
Joseph L. Toth & Clerk of the Court Tiffany M. Wagner

#### Availability for Hearings

I request hearings on one of the following dates: December 18, December 23, December 30, or  
January 3.

#### 1. Proposed Schedule:

- District Court Hearing: Between 7:30 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. on any of the listed dates.
- Ninth Circuit Court Hearing: After 12:00 p.m. on the same dates.
- Veterans Court Hearing: Either before or after the Ninth Circuit and District Court  
hearings on the same dates.

#### 2. Coordination Request:

I respectfully request that the Courts coordinate and select the most suitable date and time  
for all hearings.

#### Hearing Scope

- During the hearings, I will address any misunderstandings or procedural defects  
related to the Courts' orders and filings in the plaintiffs'/appellants' cases.
- Regarding the veterans' appeal, I have no additional evidence or arguments to  
present. If the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) maintains its decision to deny my  
dependency claim for school dependents, I will not challenge it further. My brief cannot  
persuade the VA or the court to correct their policy or procedure.

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**Hearing Notifications**

If a hearing is granted, I request that the court:

1. Notify my caretaker (Maria del Socorro Ortiz) of the scheduled date and time, and inform her to drive me to the hearing, as no written notice allowed.
2. Ensure the presence of the following attorneys at the hearing: Nefulda, Turner, Frueh, Carter, Talbert, and Stroughter. (teleconference is permitted)
3. For the Veterans Court hearing, I request that teleconferencing not be permitted, and Secret Service agents Savanna and Brandon be present in all hearings.

**If a Hearing Is Not Granted**

If none of the Courts grant a hearing, I respectfully request that the case(s) and appeal(s) be forwarded to the next appellate court, as I have no further action to take on these matters.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, I request the Courts to provide a hearing on the dates listed and ensure the presence of the aforementioned parties. I look forward to resolving these matters in a manner that respects procedural fairness and transparency.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this urgent matter.

DATED 6th day of December 2024.

Respectfully submitted,



*El Sariqueño*

Rene Ortiz, United States Marine, Combat Veteran



Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Ortiz, et al.

9th Cir. Case No. 24-5645/24-4001  
/24-1369

Appellant(s),

District Court or BAP

vs.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01456-TLN-SCR

Portfolio Recovery Associates LLC, et al. Appellee(s).

Supplement Page: Answers to questions on attached Form(s):

Form 27. ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO/FROM  
THE 9TH U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Question # 1. What do you want the court to do?

(A) Petition Appellants' Appeal For Writ of Certiorari to SCOTUS

Question # 2. Why should the court do this? Be specific. Include all relevant facts and laws that would persuade the court to grant your request. (*Attached additional pages as necessary. Your motion may not be longer than 20 pages.*)

(A) The Court declines to review the Appeal, with an excuse and extortion of the Appellants to pay Court Fees, in the amount of \$605.00 and sign Court Forms.

I, Rene Ortiz, filed Submission(s) properly and in compliance with the FRCP and the Court(s) Local Rules and who were served with this Criminal Charges/Grievances against them, and all Submission(s) were in compliance with the FRCP, the Local Rules of each Court, and the U.S. Constitution. I certify under penalty of perjury the Courts, Defendants,

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

Clerks of the Court(s), Judge(s), Sr. Judge(s), Chief Judge(s), defense and U.S. Attorneys do not- did not! read, review Rene Ortiz's submission(s) to the Court and closed, will close, or otherwise dismiss Ortiz's case(s) due to their misrepresentation(s), hearsay testimony and evidence, and their misunderstanding of the Ortiz's case(s). Ortiz's aggrievements against the Government(s) employee(s) and its' Peoples' misrepresentation(s) of fact(s), opinion(s), evidence, and law(s); their dereliction of duty is subject to criminal liability, and their breach of Oath of Office was and is treacherous to the point of being charged with Misprision of Treason (*18 U.S. Code § 2382*) or Misprision of Felony (*18 U.S. Code § 4*). Their ineptness is approaching the point of *Democratic chaos*, undermining workplace operations, leadership accountability, and the loss of Public Trust.

## PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE UNITED STATES:

Petitioner(s), Rene (PAG), Maria del Socorro, Andrew, and Ryun Ortiz, (the Ortizs)

respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant certiorari to review the decisions or lack thereof of the 9th U.S. Court of Appeals and the lower Courts.

Petitioner(s) brings this appeal on the following grounds:

### QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the lower and Appellant Courts violate Petitioners' right to due process by dismissing and closing the case(s) based on hearsay testimony and evidence, and by allowing Respondents/the Court and/or Clerk of the Court to misrepresent themselves, their clients, and the issues at hand, to include the Court(s)?

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

2. Did the lower and Appellant Courts err in denying Petitioners the right to present the merits of their case, thereby depriving them of a fair and just hearing?

3. Did the lower and Appellant Courts err in rendering decisions without jurisdiction, contrary to the Supreme Court's ruling in *Henson v. Santander Consumer USA Inc.*, which exempts Santander from the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), allowing it to collect purchased debts outside the Act's standards and protections?

4. Are Respondents in violation of laws that prohibit (1a) duplication of benefits, (1b) the unlawful debt collection, (2) improper granting/denying of VA benefits, and (3) inaccuracies in credit reporting, and should these matters be heard fully to administer justice?

#### OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions or decision(s) of the Eastern District Court, Sacramento, the U.S. District Court of Arizona, Tucson/Phoenix, and the 9th Court of Appeals, San Francisco, along with any related orders, are attached as appendices (the Courts will provide such evidence).

#### BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) as this petition seeks review of a final  
2 judgment or the lack of thereof (closure of case(s)) by the 9th Court of Appeals, and lower  
3 Courts- that being the Eastern District of California, Sacramento and the U.S. District Court  
4 of Arizona- Tucson and Phoenix, which presents substantial questions about Federal rights  
5 and Constitutional protections.  
6

7  
8  
9 **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

10  
11 Petitioners filed suits in the Eastern District Court, Sacramento and the District Court of  
12 Arizona against Respondents for engaging in duplication of benefits, unlawful debt collection  
13 practices, unauthorized granting of VA benefits, and inaccuracies in credit reporting, the  
14 denial and interference of Ortiz to peacefully and patriotically participate in the Democratic  
15 process of running for the Oval Office, all of which materially harm Petitioners. The lower  
16 and Appellant Courts dismissed and closed the case based on unreliable hearsay evidence and  
17 allowed Respondents to misrepresent key facts, parties, and issues, compromising the  
18 integrity of the judicial process.  
19  
20

21  
22 Petitioners contend that the lower and Appellant Courts lack jurisdiction to render any  
23 decision on this matter due to the Supreme Court's decision in *Henson v. Santander Consumer*  
24 *USA Inc.*, which established that Santander is not subject to the FDCPA as a debt collector  
25 and may collect debts it has purchased without complying with the Act's standards.  
26  
27  
28



Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

1 On or about April 2020, Santander informed Petitioners that it had purchased an alleged  
2 debt for which Petitioners were purportedly liable. In response, Petitioners exercised their  
3 rights under 15 U.S.C. § 1692(g) of the FDCPA, requesting verification and validation of  
4 the debt. Despite Petitioners' request, Santander provided no response, yet, on December 18,  
5 2023, it seized Petitioners' property without notice or due process.  
6

7  
8 Petitioners warned Santander that any seizure of their property without compliance with  
9 legal due process would be met with lawful forfeiture of Santander's interests, pursuant to  
10 the RICO Act. The lower and Appellant Courts' refusal to grant a hearing to address these  
11 issues, despite the continuing violations and harm inflicted on Petitioners, deprives  
12 Petitioners of due process and equal protection under the law.  
13

## 14 15 16 17 REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

### 18 19 20 1. Jurisdictional Overreach and Due Process Violation:

21 Lower Courts are not vested with the authority to disregard or undermine a ruling by this  
22 Honorable Court, particularly in light of *Henson v. Santander*, which excludes Santander  
23 from FDCPA debt collection regulations. The lower and Appellant Courts' dismissals and  
24 closure of cases based on hearsay evidence and procedural irregularities contradict  
25 Petitioners' Constitutional due process rights and disregard binding Supreme Court  
26 precedent.  
27  
28

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

**2. Ongoing Violations and Irreparable Harm:**

Petitioners continue to experience harm as Respondents—including Santander—are in duplication of benefits, and thereafter engage in unlawful debt collection, improper handling of VA benefits, and inaccurate credit reporting; and violation of Ortiz to peacefully and patriotically participate in the Democratic process to be a viable POTUS candidate; By denying Petitioners a hearing, lower and Appellant Courts prevent redress for these violations. Petitioners are entitled to seek protection under the FDCPA RICO Act and the U.S. Constitution to halt and remedy Respondents' continued unlawful activities.

**3. Denial of Justice and Judicial Accountability:**

Petitioners have a right to present their claims under applicable consumer protection and anti-racketeering laws. The failure of the lower and Appellant Courts to consider these claims raises substantial concerns about judicial accountability and the administration of justice, particularly as the ongoing harm persists.

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

WHEREFORE, Petitioners respectfully request that this Honorable Court:

1. Grant certiorari to review the decisions or lack thereof of the 9th Court of Appeals and the lower Courts in this matter.

Certified Mail 9589 0710 5270 1598 XXXX XX

2. Order a hearing before an impartial Court to address the merits of Petitioners' claims, including the enforcement of rights under the FDCPA and RICO Act, and the forfeiture of Santander and other Respondents' interests due to continued unlawful practices.

3. Provide such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Thank you for your consideration and patience of our Petition, we hope you will respect our Constitutional Right to petition the Government for redress of our Grievances, IAW the our filed Step One IAW the Master Agreement between the VA & AFGE; Rene Ortiz Request Mast IAW the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and his Petition of Grievance(s) agionst the Governments(s) IAW 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Respectfully submitted this 9th day of December 2024.

Rene Ortiz

Name



Signature